



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,330	12/20/2001	Isabelle Rollat	05725.0922-00	5705
22852	7590	05/03/2010		
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413				
			EXAMINER	
			YU, GINA C	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1611		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		05/03/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte ISABELLE ROLLAT, HENRI SAMAIN,
BEATRICE PERRON, and SERGE RESTLE

Appeal 2009-010551
Application 10/023,330
Technology Center 1600

Oral Hearing Held: April 21, 2010

Before CAROL A. SPIEGEL, DONALD E. ADAMS and
LORA M. GREEN, Administrative Patent Judges.

ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:

MARK D. SWEET, ESQ.
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP
901 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4413
(202) 408-4000

1 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Wednesday,
2 April 21, 2010, commencing at 9:00 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark
3 Office, 600 Dulany Street, 9th Floor, Alexandria, Virginia, before Kevin
4 Carr, Notary Public.

5 JUDGE SPIEGEL: Thank you very much. Good morning.

6 CLERK: Good morning. Calendar No. 58, Appeal
7 No. 2009-010551, Mr. Sweet.

8 JUDGE SPIEGEL: Good morning. I'd like to welcome you to
9 the Board for a hearing in Appeal No. 2009-010551, Application No.
10 10/023,330, in the matter of Ex parte Rollat.

11 If you would kindly introduce yourself and your guest? You
12 have 20 minutes for argument, and you may proceed whenever ready.

13 MR. SWEET: Thank you very much. My name is Mark
14 Sweet, and this is my colleague, Maureen Queler.

15 And here are our business cards, if you'd like that, for the
16 spelling. I apologize, my arms aren't longer.

17 Thank you for giving me 20 minutes. I don't intend to come
18 anywhere near that time period.

19 Just want to emphasize two points regarding the rejection of
20 record. As you know, there's one 103 rejection relying on two prior-art
21 references, Torgerson and Yang.

22 The two points I'd like to emphasize is that first, in the
23 rejection, the Examiner states the basis for the rejection is that it would be
24 obvious to substitute the adhesive polymer of Torgerson with the adhesive
25 polymer of Yang. And she sets that forth on, for example, pages 5 and 6 of
26 the answer.

1 The problem with that substitution is that the polymers of
2 Torgerson and Yang are different. Torgerson requires the presence of an
3 acrylate or methacrylate amide. That monomer component, which is again
4 required in Torgerson, is nowhere found in Yang.

5 So the substitution of one for the other, there can't be any
6 expectation of success for doing so. And in fact, the substitution that the
7 Examiner is suggesting goes against the teachings of Torgerson, which again
8 requires that acrylate or methacrylate amide to be there.

9 And the second point that I wanted to point out, is the divergent
10 uses and properties of the adhesives between these two references. The
11 Torgerson reference is directed to a hair-styling product. And one of the
12 properties of the adhesive is that it can be removed by water.

13 In contrast, the polymer used in Yang is supposed to be
14 water-resistant, or water-insensitive. And it's used for decorative light
15 management in optical articles.

16 So, I mean, first off, we're not dealing with anything close to a
17 hair-styling. And then we've got these divergent properties of the polymers,
18 the adhesives themselves. One is water-resistant. One can easily be
19 removed from water.

20 So based on those two points, we believe that this combination
21 that the Examiner is relying upon, is improper.

22 JUDGE SPIEGEL: Well, thank you. I think we understand
23 your position. And a decision should be coming in short order, then.

24 MR. SWEET: Okay. Thank you very much. Have a great day.

25 JUDGE SPIEGEL: Thank you. Have a good day, sir. And
26 ma'am.

Whereupon, at 9:05 a.m., the proceedings were concluded.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10